BACONIANA

VOL. XXIII. No. 91. OCTOBER, 1938

EDITORIAL.

MR. H. BRIDGEWATER'S article "Shakespeare and Italy" raises once more the question of the Poet's knowledge of the Italian language. The main incidents in the story of "The Merchant of Venice" were derived from "Il Pecorone," a fourteenth-century collection of Italian novels by Ser Giovanni Fiorentino, of which no English translation existed. The Italian collection itself was not published according to Sir Sidney Lee's "Life of William Shakespeare" (New Ed. p. 131, note 4) until 1558, and the story followed by Shakespeare was not accessible in his day in any language but the original.

The celebrated speech of Portia in the Trial Scene is an echo of the "De Clementia" of Seneca. There was no translation of the Latin into English until ten years after "The Merchant of Venice" was written. The Trial Scene itself is strictly accurate and according to the procedure of Roman Law which was in force in Florence at the time. The author of "Il Pecorone," one of "the sources" of the play, was himself a Florentine notary.

Again the use of the word "unhoused" in "Othello," Act 1, Sc. 2, affords according to Hunter (New Illus. Shakespeare Vol. ii, p. 282) one of the best proofs of Shakespeare's acquaintance with the Italian language. "Unhoused" conveys to English ears no idea of anything which anyone would be unwilling to resign. "But that I love the gentle Desdemona" cries Othello, "I would not my unhoused free condition Put into Circumscription and Confine For the Sea's worth." It is only by recollecting the way in which the Italians use "cassare" that we arrive at its true meaning which is "unmarried." A soldier was

as much "unhoused" in the ordinary meaning of the term after marriage as before. Othello would not resign the freedom a bachelor enjoys. Knight and Furness quote this with approval (Shakespeare New Variorum, Vol. VI., p. 33. A husband is the head or band of the house—the unmarried is the unhouse-banded—the "unhoused."

Dr. Johnson, in the preface to his edition of "Shakespeare," wrote that no one had discovered in the plays any imitation of Italian poetry, although the latter was held in high esteem at the time they were written. There is, however, a very strong resemblance between some lines of the Italian author, Matteo Boiardo, who died eighty years before Shakspere, and the well-known speech of Iago's, "Who steals my purse steals trash." The extract referred to may be found in BACONIANA, Vol. XVIII, No. 68, while Iago's speech is also, according to Richard Grant White, a perfect paraphrase of a stanza of Berni's poem, "Orlando Innamorato," untranslated into English at the time "Othello" was written.

Although the name of the Bacon Society appears by unfortunate inadvertence upon the cover of the pamphlet distributed with this issue of BACONIANA and is described as a supplement thereto, the Editors accept no responsibility for statements made and opinions expressed by the Author.

In particular Mr. Dawbarn's attitude to the Oxford theory and its apologists is certainly not that of many members of the Society.

"SHAKESPEARE" AND ITALY.

By Howard Bridgewater.

ONE of the difficulties in contending that Francis Bacon was the author of the plays of "Shakespeare" is this, that if in evidence for this you refer to his familiarity with Italy and things Italian, the critic will be very likely to meet you with the question "What evidence is there that Bacon ever travelled in Italy: Spedding says nothing about it?"

That is perfectly fair criticism. Spedding spent some thirty years in collecting all the information he could obtain with reference to Bacon; yet he makes no reference at all to his ever having been in Italy. The simple explanation is that he had no evidence of any visit to that country. But that his visit to France in the care of Sir Amyas Paulet was a matter of State and therefore referred to in State papers, there would have been no evidence other than the reference to this fact in "De Augmentis" that Bacon had even visited France, for Spedding was unable to find a single letter from Bacon to anyone relative to his having done so. Two hundred years after a man's death represents much sand in the hour glass, and the marvel of Spedding's Life is, not that it is lacking in certain details, but that it is so complete a record. The fact that fresh information has since been brought to light by assiduous students, or by chance, reflects not at all upon Bacon's great biographer. Spedding admitted that there were unfortunate gaps in the life of Bacon which he was unable to fill in, and he refers particularly to the almost complete absence of any record of Bacon during the period from 25th September 1576 until the middle of 1582 ——nearly six years, when Bacon was between the ages of 16 and 22. He tells us of his residence for three months in the year 1577 in Poictiers "in the wake of the French Court" and adds "so that he had excellent opportunities

of studying foreign policy. Of the manner in which he spent this time, however, we have no information."

Spedding then prints four letters of Bacon dated July, September and October of 1580, to a Mr. Doyle at Paris, and to his Uncle and Aunt, Lord and Lady Burleigh, written from Gray's Inn, and then adds "From this time (1580) we have no further news till 15th April 1582"—18 months.

Now not only is there this gap of 18 months, during which Bacon might have gone abroad, but there is the more important period of three years between 1577, when we know he was in Poictiers, and July 1580 when we find him writing from Gray's Inn. What is more likely than that when on the Continent in 1577 he went to Italy?

But while the time of his journey can only be inferred, that point is quite unimportant as compared with the evidence that he did travel in Italy; for if this is well founded it will at once explain how it is that the knowledge of Italy manifested in the Plays of "Shakespeare" is so extraordinary, and admitted by orthodox critics as unlikely to have been acquired by anyone not having visited that country.

That evidence was apparently first discovered by Rev. Walter Begley, who describes in his work "Bacon's Nova Resuscitatio" (vol. 3) how in 1905 he found in Paris a French book written by Pierre Amboise, Escuyer, Sieur de la Magdeleine. It is dated 1631 and is important in that it is the first biography of Francis Bacon. It consists of a dedication to the Lord Keeper of the seals of France: an explanatory address to the reader; "A Discourse on the life of Francis Bacon, Chancellor of England" and last the body of the work, pp. 1 to 567, containing "the translations which the author had made, being helped, as he gives us to understand, by Bacon's original manuscripts." How he obtained these documents we are not told, but Mr. Begley surmises that they were part of those numerous collections for natural history which occupied so fully the attention of the fallen Chancellor shortly before his death. He thinks Amboise probably obtained them from Sir William Boswell, who was sometime English Minister in

Holland, and who had a considerable quantity of Bacon's papers left him by will. Rawley and Boswell and, apparently, Archbishop Tenison had between them the disposal of all the MSS. left by Bacon. Boswell did not print any of those left in his charge, but evidently gave some of them to a certain Isaac Gruter who published them in Holland. Amboise states that he obtained his material when he was with M. de Chasteauneuf's train during an embassy, though whether this embassy was to Holland or England he does not say, but it appears that Chasteauneuf visited England in 1629.

Chief interest in this book of Pierre Amboise—which incidentally had no engraved title page to recommend it—lies in the fact that in this contemporary work we are told that, thanks to the generosity of his father, Francis was sent on his travels at an early age, and that he went both into Italy and Spain, especially with a view to learn the laws and customs of the people and their different forms of government. Pierre Amboise says that these travels occupied "quelques années de sa jeunesse," but does not mention the years in which they occurred.

It appears from the "Privilège du Roi," which in France secures the author's copyright, that Amboise's original intention was to include in the book some letters of Bacon, but unfortunately that intention was not carried out. Mr. Begley infers that it was probably these letters which informed him of Bacon's early travels.

But from whatever source Pierre Amboise obtained his information we have in his book (a copy of which is preserved in the British Museum) the unqualified statement that Bacon went both to Italy and Spain, and, touching the veracity of that statement I should say that there was no inducement to Pierre Amboise to invent it. It is a fair presumption, therefore, that he had good authority for it. Moreover his book is quoted as an authority by Gilbert Wats in 1641, while Sir Toby Mathew's Italian edition of Bacon's Essays contains evidence that Bacon was a friend of the then Grand Duke of Tuscany, Cosimo de Medici.

William Ball in his edition of Bacon's works, 1837, reprints as being by Bacon a paper entitled "Observations

on the State of Christendom." Spedding was not satisfied that this was Bacon's work, but if by chance Wm. Ball was correct, it reveals knowledge of the Princes and people of Italy which could hardly have been gained otherwise than by a visit to that country. Spedding apparently thought this paper was the work of Anthony Bacon; but if so, it is, I believe, the only document of his we have. Moreover Mallet, writing in 1740, records F. Bacon's authorship of this paper.

We now come to the internal evidence that the author of "Shakespeare" must have travelled in Italy, and this evidence is as clear as that which, without any actual knowledge of the fact, would be taken without question to prove that Robert Burns was familiar with Scottish homesteads.

As you know, I like nothing better than to confute the orthodox out of their own mouths. Prof. Dover Wilson himself agrees that the knowledge of Italy displayed in the Plays argued personal acquaintance with that country on the part of the author of them.

I am going to quote that great orthodox Danish student of "Shakespeare," Prof. George Brandes, because he not only expresses the same opinion but gives chapter and verse in support of it. No one, I think, who has read George Brandes' work "William Shakespeare, A Critical Study" could fail to have been impressed with his wonderful insight into the genius of "Shakespeare." He writes of the author that he stood co-equal with Michael Angelo in pathos and with Cervantes in humour, and his comments upon each of the plays reveals him as one of the greatest literary critics who have ever lived. He is not surpassed in the scholarship which he brings to bear on the subject even by Dr. R. M. Theobald, Ignatius Donnelly in the First Part of "The Great Cryptogram" or Prof. A. C. Bradley or Samuel Taylor Coleridge. His book was published by Heinemann, just 40 years ago. He laboured under the terrible handicap of apparently having never heard that there was any question as to the authorship. Thus while he bitterly deplores the lack of knowledge concerning the life of the author, he attempts with the totally inadequate

material at his disposal to indicate some connection between Shakspur's life-incidents and the sequence of the Plays—and this notwithstanding that he himself writes "It has become the fashion to say, *not without some show of justice*, that we know next to nothing of Shakespeare's life."

In a chapter headed "Did Shakespeare Visit Italy" he freely admits that there is no certain knowledge that Shakespeare ever did. But he is most anxious to indicate that he might have done so, for the reason, as he says of some of the Plays such as *The Taming of the Shrew*, *The Merchant of Venice* and *Othello*, that there is in them "such an abundance of details pointing to actual vision that it is hard to account for them otherwise than by assuming a visit on the poet's part to such cities as Verona, Venice and Pisa." So he thinks he may have gone there in 1593 when the London theatres were closed because of the plague. He says "To the Englishman of that day Italy was the goal of every longing. Men studied its literature and imitated its poetry. It was the beautiful land where dwelt the joy of life. Venice especially exercised a fascination stronger than that of Paris. Many of the distinguished men of the time are known to have visited Italy—men of Science like Bacon, and afterwards Harvey, etc. . . . Most of these men have themselves given us some account of their travels, but the absence of any mention of such a journey on his (Shakespeare's) part is of little moment if other significant facts can be adduced in its favour. And such facts are not wanting. There were in Shakespeare's time no guide books for the use of travellers. What he knows then of foreign lands and their customs he cannot have gathered from such sources. Of Venice, which Shakespeare has so vividly depicted, no description was published in England until after he had published his *Merchant of Venice*. Lewkenor's description of the City, itself a mere compilation of second-hand, dates from 1598, Coryats from 1611, Moryson's from 1617."

"In Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*" he says, "we notice with surprise not only the correctness of the Italian names, but the remarkable way in which at the very begin-

ning of the Play several Italian cities and districts are characterised in a single phrase. Lombardy is "the pleasant garden of great Italy;" Pisa is "renowned for grave citizens," and here the epithet "grave" is especially noteworthy, since many testimonies concur to show that it was particularly characteristic of the inhabitants of Pisa." C. A. Brown in "Shakespeare's Autobiographical Poem," has pointed out the remarkable form of the betrothal of Petruchio and Katherine (namely, that her father joins their hands in the presence of two witnesses) and observes that this form was not English but peculiarly Italian. It is not to be found in the older Play, the scene of which, however, is laid at Athens.

Special attention was long ago directed to the following speech at the end of the second act, where Gremio reckons up all the goods and gear with which his house is stocked.

> First, as you know, my house within the city
> Is richly furnished with plate and gold;
> Basins and ewers to lave her dainty hands;
> My hangings all of Tyrian tapestry;
> In ivory coffers I have stuffed my crowns;
> In Cyprus chests my arras counterpoints,
> Costly apparel, tents and canopies,
> Fine linen, Turkey cushions boss'ed with pearl,
> Valence of Venice gold in needlework,
> Pewter and brass and all things that belong
> To house or housekeeping.

Lady Morgan long ago remarked that she had seen literally all of these articles of luxury in the palaces of Venice, Genoa and Florence. Miss Martineau, in ignorance alike of Brown's theory and Lady Morgan's observation, expressed to Shakespeare's biographer, Chas. Knight, her feeling that the local colour of *The Taming of the Shrew* and *The Merchant of Venice* displays "such an intimate acquaintance, not only with the manners and customs of Italy, but with the minutest details of domestic life, that it cannot possibly have been gleaned from books, or from mere conversation with this man or that, who happened to have floated in a gondola."

On such a question as this the decided impressions of feminine readers are not without a certain weight. Brown pointed out as specifically Italian such small traits as Iago's scoffing at the Florentine Cassio as "a great arithmetician, a counter caster," the Florentines being noted as masters of arithmetic and bookkeeping. Another such trait is the present of a dish of pigeons which Gobbo, in *The Merchant of Venice*, brings his son's master. Karl Elze, who has strongly insisted upon the probability of Shakespeare's having travelled Italy, dwells particularly upon the apparent familiarity with Venice. The name of Gobbo is a genuine Venetian name and suggests moreover the kneeling stone figure "Il Gobbo di Rialto" that forms the base of the granite pillar to which, in former days, the decrees of the Republic were affixed. Shakespeare knew that the Exchange was held on the Rialto island.

An especially weighty argument lies in the fact that the study of Jewish nature to which his Shylock bears witness would have been impossible in England where no Jews were permitted by law to reside, since their expulsion began in the time of Richard Coeur de Lion and was completed in 1290. Not until Cromwell's time was the embargo removed in a few cases. On the other hand there were in Venice more than 1100 Jews (according to Coryat as many as 5,000 to 6000). One of the most striking details, as regards *The Merchant of Venice* is this; Portia sends her servant Balthasar with an important message to Padua, and orders him to ride quickly and meet her at the common ferry which trades to Venice. Now Portia's palace at Belmont may be conceived as one of the summer residences, rich in art treasures, which the merchant princes of Venice at that time possessed on the banks of the Brenta. From Dolo on the Brenta it is 20 miles to Venice —just the distance which Portia says that she must measure in order to reach the city. If we conceive Belmont as situated at Dolo it would be just possible for the servant to ride rapidly to Padua, and on the way back to overtake Portia, who would travel more slowly, at the ferry which was then at Fusina at the mouth of the Brenta. How exactly Shakespeare knew this, and how uncommon the

knowledge was in his day, is shown in the expressions he uses and in the misunderstanding of these expressions on the part of his printers and editors. The lines in the fourth scene of the third act, as they appear in all the quartos and folios are these:—"Bring them I pray thee with imagined speed unto the *tranect*, to the common ferry which trades to Venice." "Tranect" which means nothing, is of course, a misprint for "traject" an uncommon expression which the printers clearly did not understand. This, as Elze has pointed out, is simply the Venetian word "traghetto" (Italian "tragitto"). How should Shakespeare have known either the word or the thing if he had not been on the spot?

In the induction to *The Taming of the Shrew* where the nobleman proposes to show Sly his pictures, there occur these lines:—

"We'll show thee Io as she was a maid,
And how she was beguiled and surpris'd
As lively painted as the deed was done."

These lines, as Elze has justly urged, convey the impression that Shakespeare had seen Corregio's famous picture of Jupiter and Io. This is quite possible if he travelled in North Italy at the time suggested, for from 1585 to 1600 the picture was in the palace of the sculptor Leoni at Milan and was constantly visited by travellers. Brandes says, "If we add that Shakespeare's numerous references to sea-voyages, storms at sea, the agonies of sea sickness, etc., together with his illustrations and metaphors borrowed from provisions and dress at sea, point to his having made a sea-passage of some length, we cannot but regard it as highly probable that he possessed a closer knowledge of Italy than could be gained from oral descriptions and from books."

In *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* it is said that Valentine takes ship at Verona to go to Milan. This seems to betray a gross ignorance of the geography of Italy. Karl Elze, however, has discovered that in the sixteenth century Verona and Milan were actually connected by a canal. In *Romeo and Juliet* the heroine says to Friar Lawrence, "Shall I come again at evening mass?" This sounds

strange, as the Catholic church knows nothing of evening masses; but R. Simpson has discovered that they were actually in use at the time, and especially in Verona. Again Shakespeare has been criticised for having referred to Giulio Romano as a sculptor, whereas he was generally known as a painter. But Elze points to a Latin epitaph on Romano, quoted by Vasari, which speaks of "Corpora sculpta pictaque" by him, and here again finds testimony to the author's exceptional knowledge of Italy.

In *The Nineteenth Century* of Aug., 1908, Sir Edward Sullivan contributed an article on the subject of "Shakespeare and the Waterways of North Italy," in which he proves by quotations from Italian writers of and prior to the seventeenth century, and with the aid of a map of Lombardy published in 1564, reproduced by permission of the British Museum, that the high road from Milan to Venice was by water, thus justifying Prospero's description of his midnight journey with Miranda to the sea. The Italian writer quoted by Sir Edward is Bruschetti, in his "Istoria dei progetti e delle opere per la Navigazione del Milanese." Not only are other Italian authors quoted in confirmation, but English writers. Old English books entitled "The Pylgrymage of Sir R. Guylforde" relating a journey made in 1506 and another describing the pilgrimage of Sir Richard Torkington in 1517, are quoted in support of the contention that much travelling in Italy was was then done by water. Guicciardini's History of Italy is requisitioned to prove that in June 1431 Nicolo Trevisano a captain of the Signorie of Venice had a powerful fleet all but wiped out by the Milanese ships under Ambrogio Spiniala, close by Cremona.

Sir Edward also refers to the fact that critics, from Ben Jonson downwards, have described as a blunder the passages in *The Winters Tale* which attribute a sea coast to Bohemia. He says "There is nothing in the play to warrant the assumption that the period of the action is that during which it was written. The mention of the oracle of Delphos suggests the Bohemia of a very much earlier date. Under the rule of Ottocar (1255-1278) . . . his dominions extended . . from the *Adriatic to the*

shores of the Baltic." Bohemia then comprised all the territories of the Austrian monarchy.

Even Mr. Horatio Brown, who, owing to his own lack of some of the knowledge above referred to, was critical as to the author of Shakespeare having been in Italy (he being an orthodox Stratfordian) has this to say in reference to the topographical knowledge displayed in *The Merchant*. "Yet in spite of this ideal geography we are startled every now and then, by a touch of topographical accuracy so just as almost to persuade us that Shakespeare must have seen with outward eye the country which his fancy pictured; must have travelled there and carried thence a recollection of its bearings." But having said that, and being persuaded that the Stratford yokel wrote the plays, he has to eat his own words by remarking at the end of a long description showing how accurate in fact the author was, "yet we cannot believe that this accuracy is due to more than a striking but fortuitous coincidence!"

WORD AND BI-LITERAL CYPHERS.

By Kate H. Prescott.

IT is several years since I outlined this present article, simply for my own satisfaction, but I feel the results are important and should be preserved. Several requests recently to see the results of my work, induced me to get it into shape.

I had at that time begun to realize that a number of Baconians who were willing to accept the Bi-Literal Cypher, since Bacon claimed it as his invention in his De Augmentis (1623), were absolutely ignoring the Word Cypher of Dr. Owen. Even when shown that directions were given in the Bi-Literal for this Key Word Cypher, making Dr. Owen's work still more remarkable, doubts were frequently expressed as to the possibility of the deciphering being correct without the rules given in the Bi-Literal. Having been convinced by personal investigation and study, that both cyphers were correct, I thought it would be of not a little interest to parallel the instructions as given in the "Letter to the Decipherer" found in the first volume of Word Cypher Story, deciphered by Dr. Owen in 1893, and those given in the Bi-Literal deciphered by Mrs. Gallup 1900; (These directions were collected and printed in the work entitled "The Lost Manuscripts," published in 1910, where my quotations will be found) and also to give the titles of the different divisions of the story as given in both cyphers. The Word Cypher has been only in part deciphered while the Bi-Literal has been applied to works from 1579-1671.

I believed that such a parallel would prove at least two things; First, that Bacon left a system perfected, which was possible (though he feared not probable) to be discovered and applied without the aid of the rules given in the Bi-Literal: and secondly, that where there are seeming differences in the method, they do not in any way affect the results. Long before the Bi-Literal was found

to have been used by Bacon, the material in the fifth volume of the Word Cypher Story, was entirely deciphered by Dr. Owen's assistants, Mrs. Gallup among them, while he was in the far west. I am not claiming the impossibility of any errors having been made; indeed it would be quite inconceivable that no errors crept into Bacon's part of it; but knowing the exactness of the cyphers, it is not possible that any fundamental rules were wanting in Dr. Owen's work. "If any questions were passed over, there will be so much rawness that the History will be rejected, and pronounced untrue." (Word Cypher Vol. 1, page 30.)

I will say for the benefit of those who have never read the first volume of the Word Cypher Story, that the first chapter is called "The Letter to the Decipherer" (whomever he may be) and is in form of a dialogue or questions and answers, carried on between Bacon and his Decipherer. "My first important letter to you concerns my greatest inventions of a means of transmitting what so ever I wish to share." (Bi-L. page 66). In this letter are the directions which Bacon gave for unravelling the story. At the close of each division of the story, the title and keys for the next part are clearly set forth. These keys were not published at the time; that they must have been the same in both cyphers, my parallels prove.

Word Cypher.

"By the asking of questions and the answers tell you in what disjoined and separate books the secrets are laid up——If only care be taken that the text be torn to pieces and diligently sifted for the questions and these answers, which are well shadowed out in endless variety; for the story begins with questions and we put together the questions and the answers plainly. It is necessary to take all the questions to find our cues." (Page 2.)

Bi-Literal Cypher.

"My keys are Question or Inquiry and every noun or verb, from any Interrogative or answer. (Page 54.)

Keys are used to point out the portion to be used. These keys are words imploied in a natural and common way but are marked by capitals, the parenthesis, or by *frequent and unnecessary iteration*." (Page 62.)

"Reade easy lessons first, and forsooth the Absey in Life and Death of King John, act one, is a good one; it shewes the entrance to labyrinth."

(3rd Edition B-L., page 166.)

In "Life and death of King John" (Folio 1623, Act 1, scene i) where occurs the first line of the word cypher story, we read in the soliloquy of Bastard—"and when my knightly stomache is sufficed, why then I suck my teeth and catechize My picked man of Countries: 'my deare sir, Thus leaning on mine elbow I begin,' I shall beseech you; that is the question now, And then comes answer like an Absey booke: O sir, sayes answer, at your best command, At your employment, at your service sir: No sir, saies question, I sweet sir at yours, And so ere answer knowes what question would, Saving in Dialogue of Complement," etc. The "unnecessary iteration" of Question and Answer is plainly seen here.

Word Cypher.

"The first question is therefore what simple plain rule is there to teach me the way to shift Sir, the mightiest space in fortune nature brings, to join like, likes and kiss like native things. (Page 3.)

Therefore let your own discretion be your tutor, and suit the action to the word and the word to the action. With this special observance, that you match conjugates, parallels and relatives by placing instances which are related one to another by themselves." . . . (Page 8.)

"Match the syllogisms duly and orderly and put together systematically and nimbly the chain or coupling, links of the argument. This is to say the connaturals, concurrences, correspondents, collocations, analogies, similitudes, relatives, parallels, conjugates and sequences of every thing, relating to the combination, composition, renovation, arrangement, and unity revolving in succession part by part through the whole." (Page 25.)

——"throw your eyes upon Fortune that goddess blind that

Bi-Literal Cypher.

"You must likewise keep in mind one very important rule, it is that like must be joined to like. Match each key with words of like meaning, like nature or origin.

These are sometimes called, in many prose phamphlets and the works of Philosophy or science, Conjugates, Connaturals and Similars or Parallels." (Page 69.)

"There will with a little observing bee discried words which are repeatedly used in the same connection. These must be noted specially since they form a series of combining or joining words, which like the marks the builders putteth on the prepared blocks of stone showing the place of each in the finished building, point out with unmistakable distinction its relation to all other parts." (Page 62.)

Word Cypher.

stands upon a spherical stone, that turning and inconstant rolls in restless variation. Mark her the prime mover. She is our first guide." "Have I discovered your first great guide and stop?" "You have, and the first chapter by its aid will now be laid open and found out." (Page 3.)

"Doth Fortune show all?" "One touch of Nature makes the whole world kin. Our second guide is the Latin Word Natus." (Page 6.)

"It is certain you shall see that now and then Fortune and Nature are at fault and then we made Honor and Reputation the two words to guide you toward the end." (Page 6.)

Bi-Literal Cypher.

On pages 53-4 of the Bi-Literal we find Bacon shows seven of these guides each representing one of the seven masques used in the Word Cypher. "Time" standing for Bacon, "Reputation" Marlowe, "Art" Shakespeare, "Honor" Spenser, "Truth" Burton, "Fortune" Green, "Nature" Peele,—"and showes when a sudden shift is to be made."

Here occurs the first marked difference between the rules in the two cyphers, and yet if we examine the differences we shall find they are not vital. It is fair to ask: Could the work have been accomplished with four guides when seven are given in the Bi-Literal? It was shown that these seven guides were used simply to facilitate the work; for instance, the keys to the first "Letter," as given in both Cyphers, were Question and Answer, and we are told to search for all these keys. Dr. Owen's method was to go through every line of the seven sets of works and mark these keys and the passage or line to be set aside. Had he used the "Guides" as each standing for a particular author, when a passage from Bacon gave the Guide word "Reputation," he would have known that his next passage would be found in Marlowe, but having found his keys to Marlowe, he must still apply the rules given in both Cyphers for bringing parts together by the use of the "joining words," so that the ultimate results must be the same. To explain further,—we must remember that Dr. Owen's studies were in the first instance concerned *only* with the *Shakespeare plays* and with *no* thought of any

other authorship. He was however early in his studies convinced of a message other than the exterior ones. When after many years he was led to the passage in King John and the Words "Question and answer," he tried to find still other passages with these words conspicuously in or near them, and brought the parts together. He soon found that there were breaks in the message and that some other work must be joined with the plays. Gradually all his masques were revealed, all given in the Shakespeare plays. "The basis of our devise is the stage, and we insert the titles of every play, and of all our books, plainly about the keys to prompt and instruct you." (Word Cypher page 24.)

As soon as he placed the necessary books upon the "Wheel" the method in its perfection was before him. These "Guides" were no more a necessary factor in the results than the "Wheel" upon which he placed the books for ready reference.

Word Cypher.

"And it now becomes absolutely necessary for you to search out the works of which you are not already possessed and put them upon your Wheel."

Will you name the works under which you have concealed, hid, and masked yourself? "We will enumerate them by their whole titles from beginning to the end; William Shakespeare, Robert Green, George Pell, and Christopher Marlow's stage plays; The Fairy Queen, Shepherd's Calendar, and all the works of Edmund Spenser; The Anatomy of Melancholy of Robert Burton, The History of Henry the Seventh, The Natural History, The Interpretation of Nature, The Great Instauration, Advancement of Learning, the De Augmentis Scientiarum, our Essays, and all the other works of our own." (Page 22.)

Bi-Literal Cypher.

If you have written all this in order, a supposition very improbable, you know the names chosen as masques. Green, Spenser, Peel, Shakespeare, Burton and Marlowe. (Page 41.)

Having found that both Cyphers give us the same masques, or exterior works to be used in the Word Cypher, let us next compare the subjects decyphered by the Word Cypher, with what we are told in Bi-Literal we shall find. The five volumes of Word Cypher story contain "The Letter to the Decipherer." "The Epistle Dedicatory," "Description of the Queen, General Curse," "Bacons Life at the Court of France," "The Spanish Armada," two plays, the "Tragedy of My Brother, the Earl of Essex," "Mary Queen of Scots."

(Bi-Literal page 66) "My first important letter to you contains my greatest invention of a means of transmitting what so ever I wish to share" (page 32) "Keys of the History of my Beloved Essex."

(Page 33) "Making your next portion of the work the Armado for Spain." (page 41) "Your next should be my Life at the Court of France, then a drama, Mary Queen of Scots."

On pages 66-7 of the same work Bacon tells us that he has hidden his translations of Homer and Virgil in Cypher. This was found many years ago by Dr. Owen; but his publishers, not realizing the literary importance of a translation so buried, did not have it deciphered.

I cannot see how it would be possible for the results to be so far identical, if the rules as found by Dr. Owen were not entirely adequate. And when one realizes that omitting one key-marked passage throws the whole story off, one must be impressed with the completeness of the method. Furthermore, when we read on page 64, Bi-Literal cypher, "If he discover the key of my newe invention himself, before it bee explained, it shall redound to his credit," we must admit as I have before stated, that Bacon knew it was possible to find his rules and apply them without the aids given in the Bi-Literal.

"MODERATION IN MODERATION!"

By H. KENDRA BAKER.

MR. BRIDGEWATER'S recent "Plea for Moderation" (BACONIANA, July 1938) raises questions which need careful consideration. All will agree as to the necessity for moderation in presenting all aspects of the Baconian case, the insistence upon theories based on inadequate evidence being undoubtedly calculated to do more harm than good to the Cause. But there are matters which, treated with a due sense of proportion, would seem to be not only legitimate but desirable subjects for study and research.

In fairness to those who devote a good deal of time and energy to these, it is felt that some of Mr. Bridgewater's premisses and conclusions call for a little qualification.

1. Is it, for example, quite accurate to allege "the scant consideration given to the Baconian theory both by the public and the Press?"

As a subscriber to a Press Cutting Agency and a fairly frequent contributor to Press correspondence, my experience leads me to a different conclusion. One has frequently been surprised at the readiness with which contributions have been received by the Press, and the genuine interest they seem to arouse judging from the correspondence to which they give rise.

Baconians would seem to be justified in believing that the question is receiving a more sympathetic consideration than it has had for many years.

2. With regard to the allegation that "assertions by individual members are often extravagant and sometimes absurd," one ought first to define these terms, and as opinions differ widely—even among Baconians themselves—may we not ask for "moderation" in framing a definition?

It thus seems desirable to decide not what lines of research are permissible to Baconians individually, but those which the Society should recognise and advocate as its own before opinions thereon are so stigmatised, for otherwise discouragement may ensue.

3. For the same reason it seems hardly fair to assert, inferentially, that the Society gives "overt support to theories which its own members regard as highly controversial." The objects of the Society, a statement of which are to be found on the cover of BACONIANA, are of so wide a character as to admit of the study of practically any phase of Bacon's life, and not merely the Authorship question. Many such matters are undoubtedly controversial but, falling as they do within the objects of the Society, they are surely admissible subjects for discussion, and might not the Society be charged with partiality if it failed to afford facilities for such discussion? This can hardly be called "overt support" but rather "legitimate opportunity."

4. And thus we come to the question: What *are* legitimate subjects for study and discussion. The royal-birth theory, for example , is one which should be handled with great discretion. It is certainly not one to dogmatise upon until we know a great deal more than we do at present. But none the less it is one connected with Bacon's life (within the meaning of the objects of the Society) and as such would seem to be an admissible Subject for study and research, so long as it is not pressed as an Article of Faith. Mr. Bridgewater's assertion that "even though this could be established, it would be of no advantage to us," may surely be considered as rather beside the point. The society exists for the purpose of bringing Truth to light, whether it be to our advantage or otherwise. We must take the rough with the smooth, and it might operate to our undoing were we to reject evidence if such were found, solely on the ground that it was not to our advantage.

5. The same principle would apply to the point that "the fame of Francis Bacon would be no fairer, if Leicester was his Father." That may be so, but we must take our chance of it. Those who can find no reason-

able explanation for the disinheriting of Francis Bacon by his reputed Father would seem to be quite justified in seeking some solution of the mystery surrounding his upbringing.

That such evidence, if and when found, should conflict with the theory of the Baconian authorship of the collection known as *"The Northumberland MS"* would not surely justify us in rejecting it: one is as much a theory as the other, and a great deal more evidence is needed before we can confidently attribute *Leycester's Commonwealth* to Bacon any more than we can to Parsons. On the MS itself it is stated to be "Incerto auth(ore)." It is a subject for study, and, as many think, a very interesting one. It does not rest exclusively on the so-called "cipher story"; there are independent indications of a mystery surrounding his parentage which cannot be ignored. The very interest exhibited by Elizabeth in the education and upbringing of Francis (entirely wanting in the case of Anthony) is of itself sufficiently strange to put an investigator "on his enquiry", and this without any reference to ciphers. And with regard to Burleigh "urging the Queen to marry the Duke d'Alencon, Leicester being still alive," it would surely be exceedingly risky to base any hypothesis on that. Have we the slightest evidence that Elizabeth ever really *intended* to marry d'Alencon, any more than any other of her numberous suitors? She was, as I have shewn elsewhere, an "Enigma" and we need to know a vast deal more of what went on beneath the surface before we can venture to express any opinion on what passes for the history of that period. Does anyone, for instance, really believe that when Elizabeth "urged" Leicester to marry Mary Queen of Scots she meant him to?

6. And so, too, with other problems concerning Bacon's life, apart from the authorship question. With the oft-repeated qualification as to a due sense of proportion, it would, I feel, be unwise to accept Mr. Bridgewater's view that in supporting the Society in the consideration of such Baconian problems "we only weaken its case and prejudice his claims by associating them with speculations, too often offered in the guise of facts." There is, of

course, no justification for offering speculations as facts; but I hardly think such an indiscretion is common among members of the Society. So long as all theories are put forward tentatively, it is difficult to see why they should not be discussed as possibilities. To take two concrete cases: Bacon's attitude towards Essex, and his conduct as Lord Chancellor have no direct bearing on the authorship question. Yet most of us know perfectly well that one of the commonest objections we have to meet is that a man who could "so shamelessly betray his friend" and was "a corrupt judge," "could not possibly have been the author of Shakespeare's Works." Indeed they regard the suggestion as "extravagant" and "absurd!"

Before all things it is necessary, therefore, to demonstrate to such people that their prejudice is entirely without foundation, and not until then will they even begin to consider the authorship claim. Yet, how are we to do this if we are to confine ourselves solely to the authorship question? One feels that one could take no interest whatever in a person capable of such enormities as are—ignorantly—attributed to Bacon. His vindication in this respect should be regarded as a prime necessity, and this whether or no it has the slightest bearing on his authorship. But one cannot admit that it has no such bearing, seeing that his relations with Essex involve the inditing of a Sonnet to Elizabeth on the latter's behalf, "though I profess not to be a poet;" and his protest against his being included in the prosecution on the ground that "it would be said I put in evidence mine own tales," referring to the play of Richard II and possibly, too, that of Henry IV.

7. The question whether Bacon was a Freemason appears an interesting and a harmless one. Treated discreetly, it seems in no way calculated to "weaken our case": he could have been a Poet—or even a Prince!—and yet have been a Freemason. But here again, as in every case, we should be careful to see that the evidence—like the quality of mercy!—"is not strained."

8. Again, if enquiry is permissible into the facts concerning Bacon's birth it would be equally permissible into those concerning his death. Much has come

to light in the years that have elapsed since Mr. Bompas made the statement quoted by Mr. Bridgewater. All knowledge is progressive: were it not so the Bacon Society would hardly be able to justify its existence. And when it is asked, "What possible purpose could be served by substituting for history a tale told with the object of enshrouding the time and manner of his death in mystery?" my answer would be, "the need of investigation."

Just as his birth, his life, his literary pursuits, are shrouded in mystery so it would appear is his death, and when there are indications of a conflict between such "history" and the facts, one cannot but feel that the subject is a legitimate line of research—subject to all the safeguards already mentioned. Where Bacon is concerned, History has proved rather a broken-reed in so many particulars that one is not greatly encouraged to lean upon it too confidently. Besides, are we not all up to the neck in historical heresy already—Mr. Bridgewater included!—in claiming Shakespearean honours for Bacon?

9. I have left the subject of ciphers to the last. Without special qualification, any opinion as to the genuineness or otherwise of the "cipher-story" would be valueless. Having none I do not propose to rush in where experts fear to tread! But I have a due regard for the value of expert evidence, and thus when I find one who is considered the greatest living cryptographer—General Cartier—taking the field on the side of Mrs. Gallup and her collaborators, I am compelled to take notice of it. In the *Mercure de France* of September 1st and 15th, 1922, he dealt with the biliteral cipher at considerable length by way of introduction to the cipher-story which he sets out. The space available to me admits of but one extract which is this (as translated):—

'Granted that the document which we are about to publish *in extenso* is susceptible of provoking numerous comments, and that certain parts will probably give rise to very serious objections, we think we ought to insist upon the fact, that from the cryptographic point of view, we have personally undertaken the task of verification of quite a large number of texts, and we consider that the discussion

should leave on one side the cryptographic point of view which seems to us unassailable." Now, this from such a man as General Cartier cannot possibly be ignored, whatever may be our preconceptions and prejudices.

If the Narrative set out, and thus vouched for, by him is genuine, there is no longer an "authorship question": the facts are disclosed for all to see, and other matters which may have been regarded as "extravagant" and "absurd" are also made manifest.

Thus, the question of a cipher as used by Bacon, so far from being a subject for suppression, seems to me to be one of vital importance.

But quite apart from the cipher-story itself, there are many indications that Bacon made use of a cipher.

Are we not entitled to apply to these indications similar principles to those we apply to his writings on the Drama in support of his authorship? We should be lacking, surely, in deductive reasoning were we not to do so: and besides, can we ignore what Archbishop Tenison says of the *De Augmentis* in his BACONIANA (1679)?

In conclusion: to Mr. Bridgewater I would say with Portia: "I have spoke thus much to mitigate the justice of thy plea," not from any lack of appreciation of or respect for the motives for his article which we all know to be in the best interests of the Cause, but merely with the object of soliciting for members a somewhat wider liberty of conscience and expression (within the limit of the Society's Objects) than he seems to think wholly desirable.

We are all engaged upon the same great work: let us see to it that our views at all times are tempered with that moderation for which he pleads.

BACON WROTE THE SHAKESPEARE PLAYS.

Reason II.

"The author of the Shakespeare plays was essentially aristocratic in temper and sympathy. He was profoundly interested in the public events of his time, employing the drama as a commentary on current state affairs and a direct means of political education." (Prof. Churton Collins *Studies in Shakespeare*.) His life and environment were those of an aristocrat: he was familiar with the courtly science or art of Heraldry: with the lore and chivalry of courts and kings: with falconry and hunting, not with deer stealing and rabbit catching.

He was a philosopher. "In the construction of Shakespeare's dramas there is an understanding manifested equal to that in Bacon's Novum Organum." (Carlyle: *Heroes and Hero Worship: the Hero as Poet.*) "The philosophical writings of Bacon are suffused and saturated with Shakespeare's thought." (Gerald Massey: *Secret Drama of the Sonnets.*)

The real Shakespeare was a classical scholar: Edward Dowden, one of the greatest Shakespearian authorities refers to the frequency of classical allusions in the plays. Coleridge wrote that Shakespeare's habits were scholastic and those of a student. The poems, according to Cowden Clark, "bear palpable tokens of college elegance and predilection both in story and treatment, with almost unmistakable signs of having been written by a schoolman: his acquaintance with college terms and usages makes for the conclusion he had enjoyed the privilege of a University education."

He was a gentleman by birth and education. "In Shakespeare, the speakers do not strut and bawl: the dialogue is easily great and he adds to so many titles that of being the best bred man in Christendom." (Emerson). "What has perhaps puzzled readers most is the courtesy of

Shakespeare: his easy movement in the give and take of social intercourse among persons of good breeding." (E. K. Chambers *William Shakespeare*.)

The real Shakespeare was a Lawyer with an intimate knowledge of the Common and Statute Law of England and the principles and practice of the Court of Chancery. "Only those who have had a legal training can appreciate Shakespeare's knowledge of the Law. He was never incorrect and never at fault." (Lord Penzance: *The Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy*.)

"His extraordinary knowledge of legal terminology and procedure" is emphasized in Shakespeare's most recent biography. "More convincing is the unconscious intrusion of the lawyer to the detriment in not a few cases of the poetry and the art. His legal terms are legion: sometimes they are highly technical: frequently they are metaphorical: often they are wrought into the very fibre of his verse: but most remarkable of all they flow from him in many instances unawares. No woman even is too simple in Shakespeare to know law." (Fripp: *Shakespeare—Man and Artist*.)

The real Shakespeare was the Supreme Lord of Language. "There are few lines," writes Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, "in Milton's poems which are less intelligible now than they were at the time they were written. This is partly to be ascribed to his limited vocabulary: Milton, in his verse, using not more than 8,000 words or about half the number used by Shakespeare. And one remembers that "Paradise Lost" is easily the most learned poem in our language and that Shakespeare by repute was an indifferently learned man!"

It will be seen there is nothing in the orthodox biography of William Shakespere of Stratford to correspond with the Shakespeare of the Plays. It is Francis Bacon who as aristocrat and great gentleman, philosopher, poet, passionately interested in the Drama and its Mission, learned in law and legal procedure: in ancient and modern languages: myriad-minded with innumerable interests in life and living who is the real Shakespeare—the author of the Shakespeare plays.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE CRISIS.

WHAT DARK DAYS SEEN.

(SONNET XCVII.)

A MASQUE.

Fearful wars point at me.

Cymbeline. IV.iii.

Hitler. Come, here's the map: shall we divide our right?

1 H.IV. III.i.

Chorus. I heard a bustling rumour like a fray.

J.C.II.iv.

In this troublous time, what's to be done?

III.H.VI.II.i.

What ho! Chamberlain!

1 H.II.i.

Chamberlain. Up in the air.

H.V.II.iv.

By flight I'll shun the danger which I fear.

P.I.i.

To be a make peace shall become my age.

R.II.I.i.

I will make peace with him if I can.

T.N.III.iv.

Chorus. This morning are they fled away and gone.

J.C.V.i.

Atlee. What peace you'll make advise me.

C.V.iii.

Chamberlain. I would have peace and quietness.

T. & C.II.i.

I entreat true peace of you.

R.III.II.i.

Hitler. With their high wrongs, I am struck to the quick.

T.V.i.

Despiteful and intolerable wrongs!

T.A.IV.iv.

Chamberlain. What wrongs are these?

T.A.IV.iv.

Hitler. Wrongs unspeakable, past patience.

T.A.V.iii.

(*Aside*). I will invent as bitter-searching terms
As curst, as harsh and horrible to hear
Deliver'd strongly through my fixed teeth.
2 H.VI.III.ii.

(*Aloud*). If you would the peace, you must buy that peace
With full accord of all our just demands.
Whose tenors and particular effects
You have enscheduled briefly in your hands.
H.V.V.ii.

Chamberlain. To come thus was I not constrained, but did it on my free will.
A. & C.III.vi.

Thou hast astonish'd me with thy high terms.
1 H.VI.I.ii.

With other vile and ignominious terms.
1 H.VI.IV.i.

Thou art too wild, too rude and bold of voice.
M.V.II.ii.

The bitterest terms that ever ears did hear.
T.A.II.iii.

Chorus. Parted you in good terms?
K.L.I.ii.

Hitler. I do not know that Englishman alive
With whom my soul is any jot at odds.
R.III.II.i.

This must be answer'd either here or hence.
K.J.IV.ii.

We trifle time away.
H.VIII.V.iii.

Chamberlain. We all expect a gentle answer.
M.V.IV.i.

Hitler. I am not bound to please thee with my answers.
M.V.IV.i.

Peace be to France, if France in peace permit
Our just and lineal entrance to our own.
If not bleed France, and peace ascend to heaven!
K.J.II.i.

Peace be to England, if that war return
From France to England there to live in peace.
K.J.II.i.

Chamberlain. This is no answer, thou unfeeling man.
M.V.IV.i.

Thou troubler of the poor world's peace.
R.III.I.iii.

This is the way to kindle not to quench.
C.III.i.

Chorus. His incensement at this moment is so implacable.
T.N.III.iv.
Pursue him, and entreat him to a peace.
T.N.V.i.
. . . To him again. . .
M.M.II.iii.

Czecho-Slovakia. Welcome is peace if he on peace consist.
If wars, we are unable to resist.
P.I.iv.

Chamberlain. Peace ho! no outrage, peace!
C.V.vi.

Chorus. If he do fear God he must necessarily keep peace.
If he break the peace, he ought to enter into a
Quarrel with fear and trembling.
M.A.A.N.II.iii.

Chamberlain. I hold the olive in my hand.
My words are as full of peace as matter.
T.N.I.v.

Chorus. Feed his humour kindly as we may
Till time beget some careful remedy.
T.A.IV.iii.
A little time will melt his frozen thoughts.
T.G.III.ii.
The time must by us both be spent most preciously.
T.I.ii.

Chamberlain. I shall show you peace and fair faced league.
K.J.II.i.
Thou art a Roman, be not barbarous.
T.A.I.i.
Kind Rome,
Rome, the nurse of Judgment.
H.VIII.II.iv.
Glad my heart.
T.A.I.i.

Hitler. Time and place will be fruitfully offered.
K.L.IV.vi.

Chorus. And now the matter goes to compromise.
1 H.VI.V.iv.
Induce their mediation,
A. & C.V.ii.
To trembling clients be you mediators.
Luc.

So sensible seemeth their conference.

L.L.L.V.ii.

Czecho-Slovakia. I must be present at your conference.

W.T.II.iii.

The Powers. Let them guard the door.

H.IV.v.

Chorus. They humbly sue unto your excellency
To have a godly peace concluded of.

1 H.VI.V.i.

The states of Christendom
Mov'd with remorse of these outrageous broils
Have earnestly implored a general peace.

1 H.VI.V.iv.

The Powers. And therefore are we certainly resolved
To draw conditions of a friendly peace.

1 H.VI.V.iii.

Rumour. I hear there is an overture of peace
Nay, I assure you a peace concluded.

A.W.IV.iii.

This from rumours' tongue
I idly heard: if true or false, I know not.

K.J.IV.ii.

Chorus. Peace be amongst them!

1 H.VI.V.ii.

Dig deep trenches in thy beauty's field.

Sonnets 2.

Retire into your trenches.

1 H.VI.I.v.

Come, my spade!

H.V.I.

Save thou the child.

T.A.IV.ii.

Thy child shall live and I will see it nourished.

T.A.V.i.

To the wars, my boys! To the wars!

A.W.II.iii.

Youth. Go to the wars, would you? Where a man may serve seven years for the loss of a leg and have not money enough in the end to buy him a wooden one.

P.IV.vi.

Chorus. Hew them to pieces, hack their bones asunder
Whose life was England's glory, Gallia's wonder!
O no, forbear.

1 H.VI.IV.vii.

With news, the times with labour and throws forth
Each minute, some.

A. & C.III.vii.

A member of the country's peace
Enjoys it: but in gross brain little wots.
What watch the king keeps.

H.V.IV.i.

Hitler. The English army is grown weak and faint.

1 H.VI.I.i.

Now it is time to arm! come, shall we about it?

H.V.III.viii.

Chorus. By sea he is an absolute master.

A. & C.II.ii.

Wake not a sleeping wolf.

2 H.IV.I.iii.

Let us be keen and rather cut a little
Than fall and bruise to death.

M.M.II.i.

Let's reason with him.

R.III.I.iv.

Chamberlain. Sir, you shall find me reasonable.

M.W.W.I.i.

Chorus. He will maintain his argument as well as any military man in the world.

H.V.III.ii.

Chamberlain. Be moderate, be moderate.

T. & C.IV.iv.

Hitler. Why tell you me of moderation?

T. & C.IV.iv.

The Powers. We are politicians.

T.N.II.iii.

We have made peace
Our peace we'll ratify.

Cy.V.v.

Hitler. I have been feasting with my enemy.

R. & J.II.iii.

Chamberlain. If we can make our peace
Upon such large terms and so absolute
As our conditions shall consist upon
Our peace shall stand as firm as rocky mountains.

2 H.IV.IV.ii.

Not to break peace or any branch of it
But to establish here a peace indeed
Concurring both in name and quality.
2 H.IV.IV.i.

And knit our powers to the arm of peace.
2 H.IV.IV.i.

Chorus. Urge them while their souls
Are capable of this ambition
Lest zeal now melted by the windy breath of soft petitions
Pity and remorse, cool and congeal again to what it was.
K.J.II.i.

The word of peace is rendered: hark, how they shout.
2 H.IV.IV.iii.

They threw their caps, . . . shouting their emulation.
C.I.i.

Applaud his courage.
P.II.v.

For his acts
So much applauded thro' the realm of France.
1 H.VI.II.iii.

Applause and universal shout
I never saw the like.
C.I.i.

All clapt their hands and cried Inestimable!
T. & C.II.iii.

Duff Cooper. A proper title of a peace! and purchased
At a superfluous rate!
H.VIII.I.i.

There is a thing within my bosom tells me
There is no conditions of our peace can stand.
2 H.IV.IV.i.

Chorus. A peace is of the nature of a conquest
For then both parties nobly are subdued
And neither party loser.
2 H.IV.IV.iii.

For living murmurers
There's places of rebuke.
H.VIII.II.iii.

Churchill. O inglorious league!
Shall we upon the footing of our land
Send fair-play orders and make compromise
Insinuation, parley and base truce
To arms invasive?

K.J.V.i.

Chorus. Their peace is made with heads and not with hands.

R.II.III.ii.

And therefore as we hither came in peace
So let us still continue peace and love.

1 H.VI.IV.i.

Infer fair England's peace from this alliance.

Churchill. Which she shall purchase by still lasting war.

R.III.IV.iv.

This England that was wont to conquer others
Hath made a shameful conquest of itself.

R.II.II.i.

Chamberlain. Sword, pike, knife, gun or need of any engine
Would I not have.

T.II.i.

So now dismiss your armies when ye please
Hang up your ensigns, let your drums be still
For here we entertain a solemn peace.

1.H.VI.V.iv.

All things shall be peace.

M.N.D.III.ii.

Chorus. Truly your country's friend.

C.III.i.

Your praise shall find room
Even in the eyes of all posterity.

Sonnets. LV.

What fools these mortals be!

M.N.D.II.III.

F.E.C.H.

SHAKESPEARE, MAN AND ARTIST.

"SHAKESPEARE, MAN AND ARTIST," by EDGAR I. FRIPP. 2 vols., illus. OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS. 38s. net.

SOME recent words of Mr. Desmond MacCarthy seem appropriate to a review of this latest study of William Shakespeare, the man and artist. "Respect for truth is under the weather. In politics, in history, in biography, there is a feeling everywhere that it is no use trying to disentangle truth and falsehood; that the lie in practical affairs if backed with force will prevail. History can easily be re-written to cover anything up. In literature also if backed by talent; anyhow that does not matter. I believe we shall never get straightened until we revive our respect for truth and justice. It is therefore worth while pillorying . . . ." and Mr. MacCarthy proceeded to castigate a recently published biography of Oscar Wilde.

Since Sir E. K. Chambers confessed that about the life of Shakespeare the last word of self-respecting scholarship can only be nescience, there have been several attempts by scholars to trace his development as man and dramatist, relating it to the events of his day. Dr. Harrison tried to do this in his "Shakespeare at Work" which, however, he describes as a personal interpretation, a conjectural reconstruction built up from such fragments as remain. He frankly confessed that much of his book was and must be sheer guesswork, but because he thought the documentary evidence for the life of Shakespeare and for the history of the stage easily available, he chose the form of plain narrator, unqualified by "doubtless," "probably," "we may be sure that," and other phrases, expressing scholarly diffidence. "All," Dr. Harrison wrote, "who are familiar with Shakespearian times create their own imaginary portraits of the author," and as long as these

are labelled imaginary, little mischief is done by the day dreamers.

But it is quite another matter when those responsible for the publication of this new study of Shakespeare claim that its main interest is biographical and historical, because those who look for truth or for fidelity to fact in Mr. Fripp's work will find neither biography nor history, but romance instead. Mr. Fripp deserves sympathy. William Shakspere of Stratford was not a romantic figure. He does not resemble in the least either Shelley, Keats, Byron or Swinburne. What is known of his life suggests that he was a successful business man—nothing of the artist or idealist or visionary; he was not a great failure nor a martyr nor the leader of a lost cause. As Professor George Saintsbury wrote in 1909 "We are left with a skeleton which is itself far from complete and which in most parts can only be clothed with the flesh of human and literary interest by the most perilous process of conjecture." This perilous process has had no terror for Mr. Fripp, but the skeleton grins at us through the tissue of Mr. Fripps' fancy nevertheless and the new William Shakspere refuses to come to life.

The truth must be told once more. It is worth while pillorying those who are responsible for the publication of his work, because it is still worth while disentangling fancy and fact or endeavouring so to do.

We are told that "William Shakspere was seven in April, 1571, and about that time we may believe his father took him to be enrolled in a school in Church Street." "He learned his catechism before he went to the King's School and there he learned it again in Latin." "He had three masters. One of them (Hunt) was distinguished. Hunt died at Rome on the 11th June, 1585. The greatest of his pupils was William Shakespeare. Under Roach, Hunt and Jenkins, Shakespeare, as we know from his writings, became an excellent Latin scholar. Efforts to belittle his learning due to Jonson's dictum or the wretched Bacon controversy are wide of the mark. Every poem, every play, almost every scene in the plays, exhibit training and scholarship."

The fact is there is no contemporary evidence of any kind whatever that Shakspere ever went to school at all. We simply do not know whether he did or did not.

This biography can tell us nothing of how Shakspere acquired the scholarship which the plays and poems indeed exhibit, and which, in a footnote is said to smack rather of the University man than of the Stratford Shakspere. Yet it is with this we think a real biography would concern itself. It would describe conditions which enabled the Shakespeare Genius to develop itself, led it to find the form of expression which best suited its character and secured for what it created both contemporary recognition and lasting fame. Perhaps "the wretched Baconian controversy" may yet establish the claim of the University man to acquaintance with Lilly's "Short Introduction to Grammar" "the good old Mantuan," Caesar, Livy, Virgil, Seneca, Plautus and Ovid. The difficulty was not, Mr. Fripp assures us, to bring young Shakespeare to the school book, but to keep him from it.

The fact is there is not a record even of his name as a scholar. There is no evidence that Shakspere possessed a single book, or of any opportunity to acquire one; there is nothing to suggest the young Shakspere was a student or that he was a youth of intellectual or indeed any other promise. There is no word of tribute extant either from master to genius nor from Genius in later years to a master who surely must have "taught it to lisp in numbers till the numbers came." As he became an actor he probably learned to read, but it is uncertain whether he could write more than his own name. His parents could not do this and he did not have his daughter taught to do so.

Francis Bacon as an alternative "Shakespeare" was the child of Sir Nicholas Bacon, Keeper of the Great Seal, and of Lady Ann Bacon, one of the most intellectual women of her day. He was a precocious boy indeed: at twelve years of age he was sent to Cambridge and at fifteen asked to leave as he had learned all the University could teach him. He was then enrolled as a student at Gray's Inn and subsequently went in the suite of Sir Amyas Paulet, British Ambassador to the Court of France.

We are told that with Ovid, the Bible stands out pre-eminently for its influence on Shakspere. This would, of course, be perfectly true of the Shakespeare plays, as Bishop Charles Wordsworth in "Shakespeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible" demonstrated in 1864. Dr. Thomas Carter in "Shakespeare and the English Bible" (1905) and Raymond Noble in "Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge and Use of the Book of Common Prayer" (1935) have pointed out not only the allusions by Shakespeare to Biblical persons and events but often actual quotations. Every single play furnishes examples: no fewer than forty-two books are quoted: eighteen from the Old, eighteen from the New Testament and six from the Apocrypha. It seems, however, yet another example of the eternal difficulty in reconciling the Shakespeare of the Plays with the Shakspere of Stratford: nothing that we know of the life of the latter indicates an obligation to the Bible: it certainly had little effect upon his life as we know it.

The statement that he gathered this knowledge from the morality plays, legends, sermons, lessons in church tapestry, painted cloth and what not seems utterly inadequate when it is recollected that according to Mr. Fripp himself, although it is not clear how he arrives at the figures, Shakespeare's familiarity with the Bible is at least five times that of Peele or Marlowe or any other contemporary dramatist.

"Only Francis Bacon among contemporary laymen knew his Bible so well. Not the most subtle allusion in Shakespeare to Scripture would be lost on Bacon" admits Mr. Fripp. Bacon was a student of the Bible and of the works of the Early Fathers of the Church. The First Edition of the Authorised Version contains an "Address to the Christian Reader": above it is a design which is also to be found in the First Folio over the dedication and the catalogue. Every record of the translators' proceedings has disappeared.

This wretched Baconian controversy!

When Shakespeare left school we may judge that he was a voracious young reader. Here again we must not so judge

if the commonly accepted traditions are any guide. Quiet days on the Avon, love of books, are difficult to reconcile with imprisonment for poaching, removal from school at an early age in the intervals of apprenticeship to the trade of butchery and the begetting of babies.

William, too, we may be sure was vocalist and instrumentalist. His lovely songs prove it: he could not otherwise have attained his eminence as actor and playwright. We must not think Shakspere as less than his fellow Phillips who in his will bequeathed his bass viol, cittorn bandon and lute to apprentices. What a pity Shakspere did not think of his as well as the silver gilt bowl, keen musician as we are assured he must have been!

There is of course no evidence whatever that Shakspere could play or sing a note, and he attained no eminence as an actor.

Bacon's love and knowledge of music however is fully attested: he wrote a book about it. "In my own case," he says, "when I am feeling happy, music adds to my happiness of mind, and when I feel sorrowful or vexed, it makes me yet more so."

On leaving school Shakspere was articled for three years to an attorney. This we are seriously assured is the natural inference from his marriage in 1582 (for the moment it seems a little difficult to draw any such inference from the fact of his marriage: many, indeed the majority of men, marry who are not subsequently articled to attorneys!) and from his extraordinary knowledge and large and accurate usage in his writings of legal terminology and procedure.

There is of course not one iota of evidence, nor faintest vestige of tradition that William Shakspere was ever in the office of any attorney, Registrar or pleader, whatever. He may, we are told, have served in the office of Henry Rogers the Stratford Town Clerk, and he may not. "The law is part of Shakespeare and slips from him unawares, and the facts demand professional experience in an attorney's office and without doubt at Stratford in or about the years 1579-1587."

Fancy is thus piled on Folly.

The fact is of course that it is with this knowledge of Law that, from any orthodox view of the authorship problem, it is impossible to endow Shakspere; and the worst of it for the attorney's clerk theory is that it does not account for the facts. Shakespeare's knowledge as Gerald Massey wrote is not office sweepings, but ripe fruit, mature as though he had spent his life in their growth.

By page 183 of the first of these two portly volumes we have reached Shakspere's marriage. The fancy portrait of the Poet's Bride is attractive in the extreme. She *was* Anne Hathway and not Agnes Whateley; she was her father's eldest daughter: she was of the godly, closely connected with the parish church: there is evidence of friendship between herself and her father's shepherd who entrusted to her 40s. of his savings as a gift for the poor of Stratford.

This is "pretty Fanny's way": the facts are that we are by no means certain of the identity of Shakspere's wife. We do not know, save by inference, that Anne Hathwey and Shakspere ever went through the ceremony of marriage at all. The identity of his wife is uncertain. If her name were Hathwey her first name was Agnes: if Whately it was Anne. Mr. Fripp suppresses the facts that if they did marry the bride was eight years older than Shakspere and the latter "cropt his own sweet rose before the hour." Perhaps these facts would darken a little the picture of the completely mythical Anne who sat for his portrait of Constance: who like Perdita, a queen of curds and cream, inspired Shakspere with a romantic passion, for it must be recorded that his view of wedlock was holy, high and happy: Hymen an honoured welcome guest: marriage a natural and blissful consummation.

It is Shakspere of Stratford whose life story this is—that same William whose married life we have not hitherto thought exemplary: (his age was not in general one of respect for marriage), whose Sonnets seem hardly consistent with an exalted idea of holy wedlock and the duties owed to the partner of board and bed—the same Shakspere who as William the Conqueror came before Richard III with the citizen's wife, a story which incidentally finds no

place in the story of the Puritan Shakspere as Mr. Fripp portrays him.

He seems to have deserted his wife: there is no indication that she joined him in London where he is supposed to have prospered. After his return to Stratford he certainly barred her dower in the Blackfriars property and there is no correspondence between husband and wife at all—a striking contrast to those exquisite letters which another actor, Edward Alleyn, exchanged with his Beloved.

Instead of entrusting his savings to her, her father's shepherd instructed his executors to distribute among the Stratford poor a debt of forty shillings which the wealthy Shakspere left unpaid and which the executors were directed to recover.

O Bottom thou art translated indeed!

Mr. Fripp's is (as will be seen) a new Shakspere for whose story alas! his new study is the only authority. "To his father's house in Henley Street Shakspere brought his wife: here we may believe he, when at home, had his study and Anne kept house and here among the apple trees and early summer flowers we will venture to think Anne gave birth to her child in May 1583. The young Father on Trinity Sunday (he was a month off nineteen) not unproudly accompanied the baby in her embroidered bearing cloth to the sacred edifice," and we read about the unusually large congregation, that the vicar probably officiated, and so on and so forth. Instead of suggesting that the church was a kind of rural St. George's, Hanover Square, it might have been recorded that the vicar in 1635 was suspended for suffering his poultry to roost and his hogs to lodge in the chancel.

The facts are that the cottage to which Shakspere brought his bride was probably no more than four walls and a roof, destitute of a chimney, with windows unglazed: already so overcrowded by the parents of the Poet and their family of six as to be quite unfit, we should imagine, for human habitation.

Shakspere however soon forsook the unromantic drudgery of an attorney's office for poetry and acting. For this unwarranted and outrageously unsupported

statement there is, it need hardly be said, no justification whatever: the author contemptuously rejects the tales of a runaway butcher boy, fugitive poacher and ostler at the theatre door because they are too remote in time and fact to concern the historian. This particular historian seems to prefer that of which there is no word in *any* time and which is so remote as to find no place in any domain of fact—something that never was in time and never was a fact. It is more than enough (here we may register our complete agreement) that one day in the summer of 1587 the Earl of Leicester's jesting player was taken with a well-shapen youth of 23 with auburn hair and hazel eyes, musical, an old Latin-School boy, able to use his pen in a song or poem in the revision of an old play or writing of a new, talented and trained in declamation, an athlete and a fencer, a Johanne's Factotum, passionately eager to enter the dramatic profession.

This is the revised version of Aubrey.

But the Aubrey Legends are "noticeably true and not all ill-founded" when they describe Mr. Fripp's hero as inclined to acting, able to make a speech in a big style: when however they call his father a butcher, record that his son exercised his father's trade and killed calves, they are but Egyptian darkness.

Mr. Fripp rejects the poaching tradition, yet Sir S. Lee calls it a credible one: there is small doubt, he confesses, that Shakspere's sporting experiences passed at times beyond the orthodox limits. This and the other traditions may or may not be true, but they no doubt faithfully represent the opinion of the only persons who knew the supposed dramatist in his youth and the bent of his mind and character. But having first constructed an ideal Shakespeare, Mr. Fripp, like so many others who have created Shakespeare in their own images, rejects any fact or tradition which does not suit it.

"So we must believe" Shakspere departed from Stratford and with the Earl of Leicester's men went to London to find scope for the rare histrionic and literary powers he had attained somehow, somewhere. This imaginary journey was taken by way of Norwich and Oxford: dates

(day and month) are offered. The facts are that we do not know when he began his dramatic career nor what made him choose it. The journey to London was first heard of more than a century afterwards: the deer stealing reason twenty years after that. In London, of course, he met Field, a Stratford friend. There is not one jot or tittle of evidence they ever met. But there is evidence that in 1592, the year before *Venus and Adonis* was published by Field, he and Francis Bacon rode down to Twickenham together with other friends to escape the plague which had broken out in London.

After Christmas in the Armada year the players went to the South coast on a provincial tour and Shakspere probably saw the sea for the first time, Shakspere's stately cliff, to be immortalized in *King Lear*, the beach and pier, not to mention the Castle at Dover. All these places are mentioned in the plays; therefore Shakspere saw them. On May 15th the company arrived at Plymouth where all was excitement, the Armada being awaited with impatience. Thence reluctantly we may believe northward to Exeter, Bath, Gloucester, Coventry, where they took 40s., and finally York which perhaps gave Shakespeare ideas for scenes in Henry VI, Part III.

Such is Mr. Fripp's fancy: the fact is the industrious Halliwell Phillips personally examined the records of forty-six of the principal cities and towns visited by the company, including Oxford, Cambridge, and Stratford itself, but in no single instance could he discover any notice of the player-poet. Later investigations have likewise been completely without result.

When the Earl of Leicester's company was disbanded no doubt Shakspere joined Lord Strange's men. There is a great deal of doubt indeed. All that is known is that by 1594 he had become an actor: there is an entry in the accounts of the Treasurer for this year of a payment to him and two other actors for performances at Greenwich. Nothing is known of his life in London except that he probably lodged in Bishopsgate and Southwark, defaulting in payment of subsidies at each address, and that one Wayle sought a guarantee against his breach of the peace.

Shakspere's life in London is however now illuminated for us in this way. He did not smoke or drink. Convivial and jovial are not the terms to apply to him. Drinkers suffer ill at his hands. There is no evidence to connect him with the Mermaid Tavern (surely this is as reliable as the story of John Shakspere's ability to crack a jest which Mr. Fripp appears to accept). He went home to Stratford once a year—his comings and goings are recorded in astonishing detail: we know now when William was at Oxford: when he was on tour: when his father rode to Barton: when and why the son advised the father not to go to law.

It is difficult to decide whether we ought to describe these statements as aberrations from the path of accuracy, as economy of truth, as disclosing an almost Oriental proclivity for romance, or as imaginative gems of purest ray serene. To what kind of reader do they appeal? What purpose do they serve? With what object are they written down and printed?

To create a Puritan Shakespeare in the place of one whose anti-puritan sympathies were distinguishing traits and whose preoccupation with sex even a moderately careful examination of the works reveals.

But to proceed. On Nov. 30th or Dec. 1st 1592, Shakspere celebrated his wedding day. Did this inspire Sonnet CXVI, asks Mr. Fripp? We think quite certainly it did not; although Shakspere may have indeed recollected the Form of Solemnization of Matrimony, as we are invited to think he did, we very much doubt whether it was of his marriage he was thinking when he wrote of that Love which is not the Fool of Time.

The late attorney's clerk showed himself in every act, in every scene of the *Comedy of Errors*. It was played at Grays Inn and Bacon was responsible for the particular revels, but facts are intruders into the realms of faerie. Shakspere goes on another tour, becomes a sportsman, loves a horse (all his kinsmen had horses) may have purchased roan Barbary on which, preceded by a trumpeter, he would ride into a town, through gazing streets in the garb of a king—as yet we have only reached 1594 and page

406 of Vol 1. But we must pause and associate him this Christmas not only with his young patron Southampton, but with his admirer Francis Bacon who though, of course, himself lacking in poetic and dramatic art loved plays—delighted in the show of life on the stage—few must have appreciated Shakspere more keenly. He would be one of the first to appreciate Shakspere's genius.

We feel that only the author is capable of justice to himself and we cannot forbear to quote: "He (Francis Bacon) was lover of the drama and refers often to plays in his writings. He himself contributed speeches to dramatic devices and the orations at Grays Inn revels. He was probably the 'sorcerer' responsible for bringing Shakespeare's company from Shoreditch." He speaks of the *Comedy of Errors* in his *Advancement of Learning*. The legal jests of Shakespeare's plays would not escape him. The lawyer poet spoke to the lawyer philosopher and made him laugh despite his lack of humour. Nor would the Scriptural allusions be missed. Of Elizabethan laymen Shakespeare and Bacon probably quote the Bible most frequently. The Northumberland MSS. is evidence of the popularity of both. It suggests Bacon's reminiscence of *Love's Labour Lost* which he would enjoy as a human weakness, never being in love himself.

Yet Bacon never mentions Shakspere once nor Shakspere Bacon—Bacon who indeed laid the greatest stress on the value of the drama as a means of education and of making history visible never hailed the Rising Stratford Star. And here at the end of Volume 1 we, too, will come to an end with the reflection that many wise men have written foolishly about Shakespeare and many foolish men have written occasionally wisely. We really do not know in which category to place the new study of Shakespeare, Man and Artist.

F.E.C.H.

OBITUARY.

The older members of the Bacon Society will learn with deep regret of the death, at the age of 73, of Mr. Horace Nickson, a former Chairman of the Council and a Vice-President of the Society. Mr. Nickson will long be remembered for his activity in the cause and the unflagging interest which he maintained in things Baconian until illness prevented him. Mr. Nickson took an especial interest in the problem of "Don Quixote," and gave some interesting talks on this subject at the Society's Rooms. There is the same kind of mystery surrounding "Don Quixote" as that which hangs around the Essays of Michel de Montagne. We believe it was Mr. Nickson who first detected the incorrect drawing of the sleeve in the Droeshout engraving, and suggested that this might indicate the concealed anagram BACK FRONT for FR. BACON KT. We take this opportunity of expressing the Society's deep sympathy with Mrs. Nickson in her bereavement.

THE SOCIETY'S LECTURES

Prince Henry's Room, Fleet Street, London.

Sept. 1. "Bacon's England," by Miss D. Gomes da Silva.
Oct. 6. "Bacon and Shakespeare on Love," by Mr. R. L. Eagle.
Nov. 3. "Measure for Measure," by Mr. F. E. C. Habgood.
Dec. 1. Not yet fixed.

REVIEWS.

ELIZABETH AND SIXTUS: A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY SIDELIGHT ON THE SPANISH ARMADA. By H. Kendra Baker. London, The C. W. Daniel Company. Price *7s.* 6*d.* net.

A brief notice of Mr. Kendra Baker's book was given in our last issue, but the work deserves more detailed description. We already know that Elizabeth is an enigma, but to the average reader the character and qualifications of the Italian historian, Gregorio Leti, are almost unknown. Some English scholars have written of him in a disparaging vein as untrustworthy. But Mr. Baker shows, conclusively we think, that at least so far as the doings of Elizabeth and Sixtus are concerned, Leti's narrative is entirely reliable, being corroborated at many points by other historians such as Ranke. The importance of this lies in the fact that his *Life of Elizabeth* is more than 100 years earlier than any published elsewhere. Not only so, but Leti claims that he had access to important books and documents in the library of the Earl of Anglesey, himself a man of great learning and an accomplished Italian linguist.

Leti's *History of England* gave offence in English Court circles; and this, combined with the independence of spirit shown in all his writings, may well have been the reason of his unpopularity in official quarters. Yet, as Mr. Baker points out, he was an historian of sufficient international repute to be offered the post of Historiographer to Charles II on his arrival in England. He was likewise the first biographer of Oliver Cromwell, and both this and his life of Elizabeth are replete with a mass of historical detail, the accuracy of which cannot be challenged. Mr. Frederick Chamberlain has considerable respect for Leti's reliability. As Mr. Baker remarks, "The fact that nothing recorded by Leti conflicts with what we know already concerning the Armada, but rather illumines certain dark places, such as the source from which Elizabeth obtained the information so essential to her defence, should entitle Leti to a patient and impartial hearing."

Leti's *Life of Sixtus* was published, doubtless as a precaution, under the pseudonym of Signior "Geltio Rogeri," which is merely an anagram for Gregorio Leti. It is a vivid and lively narrative, obviously based on first-hand knowledge, and gives a wonderfully interesting description of that remarkable and unconventional Pope Sixtus V, so humble and inoffensive before his election, and so masterful and ruthless the moment he was in the Chair. For English students Leti's detailed narrative of the many intrigues of

this extraordinary man, his correspondence with Queen Elizabeth, for whose statesmanship he had great respect, his account of the Spanish Armada, and many other matters of historical import, will be of the greatest interest. He tells, for example, of the activities of a certain spy known as the Chevalier Carre. This man was a Catholic, who owed his life to the Earl of Essex, and gladly showed his gratitude by performing what service he could for the benefit of Elizabeth. His identity is very doubtful. Leti also quotes in full the Papal Bull for the excommunication of Elizabeth, showing the exact grounds on which this was based.

It is well to remember that one of the chief ambitions of Sixtus was to recover the Kingdom of Naples for the Church, and it was this which caused him to encourage every kind of political plot which would embarrass Philip II of Spain and prevent his giving support to Naples. Strangely enough, at the very time when this object appeared to be within his grasp, Sixtus died. In spite of the appalling severity of his methods, it cannot be denied that he was extremely successful in purging the Ecclesiastical State from its vices and degradation. Evil doers shrank at the very mention of his name.

Leti tells many humorous stories of this remarkable man, apart from the numerous Pasquinades to which his eccentric conduct gave rise. One or two examples must suffice here. On one occasion when visiting the Jesuits they drew his attention to the fact that they had never been so poor as then. "Continue so still," replied Sixtus, "for unless you be poor you shall never be truly religious; for your poverty is beneficial to the Church, and your riches prejudicial to the Popes!" His sister, Donna Camilla, had privately remonstrated with him for wearing patched shirts, which were a disgrace for a Sovereign Pontiff; but his reply was the laughing one that "Our elevation, dear sister, should not cause us to forget our place of origin, and that rags and tatters were the first arms of our house."

Mr. Baker has done good service in drawing attention to the historian Gregorio Leti and his graphic account of a very eventful period in European history.

THE FOURTH FORGER. John Mair. Cobden-Sanderson. 8*s*. 6*d*.

The Fourth Forger is William Henry Ireland, the other three being Lauder, Macpherson and Chatterton., This study of Mr. Mair's is an interesting one of a type of mind by no means uncommon. Ireland was not alone among young men in desiring to make a fool of his father: it is even fairly common for young men to desire to prove to their fathers they are not the fools the latter think them: the problem lies in their desire to impose upon other people—doubtless the psychologists can supply an explanation of

the forgery of a lease, a note of hand and Shakspere's own copy of a letter to the Earl of Southampton.

These and many other "discoveries" were incorporated in biographies and appreciations of William Shakspere during the nineteenth century and were duly pressed into service to buttress his claims to the authorship of the plays by orthodox correspondents in a long newspaper discussion subsequently printed by the Bacon Society under the title "Shakspere Dethroned."

Ireland's success was considerable: not only his father but his dupes were anxious to believe that pages of the "Hamlet" MS. and the whole of the "King Lear" had been discovered. What were Shakspere's own portrait of himself and the fact that he had been saved from drowning by one of the forger's own ancestors to this "proof" that Shakspere and Shakespeare were one?

It is to Malone that the pricking of the bubble was due. Before the fiasco of "Vortigern" which was too much for the Drury Lane audience—it knew its Shakespeare apparently and howled the newly discovered masterpiece down—Malone, an exceedingly astute lawyer-critic, was not deceived and in the end Ireland confessed everything.

It is a most interesting story: the need for some identification of the player with the poet has, of course, been the crux of Shakespearian biographers and the Fourth Forger set out to meet it. And he is not so different to the Romantics of to-day, whose work amuses even if it cannot instruct.

SHAKESPEARE CRITICISM: AN ESSAY IN SYNTHESIS. By C. Narayana Menon. Benares Hindu University. Milford. Oxford University Press. 5s.

This is a work of considerable importance which is bound to provoke thought and argument. The author has set himself a tremendous task—to reconcile almost everything that has been written about the Shakespeare plays. Whether such a synthesis is possible and whether if it is Mr. Menon has supplied it must remain a matter for discussion. For our own part we can only offer the sincerest tribute to the author's erudition, clarity of style and enormous energy in research and promise ourselves, after a third or fourth perusal of his book, to offer readers of BACONIANA the results of our efforts to follow Mr. Menon in his pioneering path.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editors of Baconiana.

Dear Sirs,

Mr. W. A. Vaughan takes me to task for suggesting that Francis Bacon may have founded, or been connected with the Rosicrucian Brotherhood. He complains of my making 'assertions' (though I was rather making propositions and suggestions): a fault, I fear, of which he himself cannot be held guiltless!

I disagree with Mr. Vaughan's dogmatic statement as to the composition and aims of the Society, though it is quite possible that there were numbered in its ranks charlatans whose object was the exploitation of a superstitious and gullible public. Medical science, influenced by the writings of Galen, was not in the 16th and 17th centuries any way in advance of Rosicrucian ideas and practices. As the Philosopher's Stone, when discovered, was to be a universal panacea for the physical ills which plagued mankind, the search for it was not unworthy of, and was quite in keeping with the aims of the Brotherhood. We cannot judge the seeker after knowledge of those days by the scientific standards of the XXth century.

I maintain that the objects of the Brotherhood would appeal to Francis Bacon. We know that he was active on the Continent in the cause of the Reformation, and his lively and eager mind would never allow that "they also serve who only stand and wait;" he could see no use in the monastic life of contemplation unless coupled with activity.

Mr. Harold Bayley says in his "Tragedy of Sir Francis Bacon": "According to its manifestors, the object of the Rosicrucian Fraternity was to expel from the world all those things which darken human knowledge," and the shy and retiring Brethren seem to have acted up to their ideal, as God's Deputies upon Earth. Their publications deal with every conceivable subject tending to the advancement of learning, the pleasing of men's minds, and 'the bettering of men's bread and wine.' Here we come across a political pamphlet, written to resist some threatened aggression or to redress some wrong; and there a stately volume on Divinity or History, or an educational handbook on Mathematics, Euclid, or Arts and Crafts. In the great scope of their operations the Brethren seem to have taken all knowledge to be their province, and to have aimed at supplying all, or as many as possible of those things which Bacon had registered as 'deficient.' "

And if the Rosicrucians were interested in the art of prolonging life—short enough in most cases in those days—so was Francis Bacon. In his "History of Life and Death" he brings forward an idea of longevity on the basis that the principle of life resides in a subtle fluid or spirit which permeates the tangible part of the organisation of plants and animals—(the origin of speculative physiology).

The Rosicrucian Brotherhood, in the form in which it startled Europe, presents the Baconian idea of a total reconstruction and a new inception; but it may have been a reorganization, a resurrection of older societies, and it may have had an unbroken connection with the Eleusinian Mysteries. As the drama took its origin from the Demeter and Persephone myth ("The Winter's Tale" is based thereon), which formed the central doctrine of the Mysteries, together with the worship of Apollo and Bacchus (in every work of Bacon the symbolic paper-mark of 'grapes' in various forms is found) this would most profoundly stimulate Bacon's interest. He believed that an age of higher intellectual development than any the world then knew had flourished and passed out of memory long before Homer and Hesiod wrote; and he declared that he was going "the same road as the ancients." He cannot be referring to his method of philosophy, which was inductive, and he had disclaimed Aristotle. The true solution is that he joins hands with the ancients in their Mysteries, around their altars, with Heraclitus, Empedocles and the creative doctrine of Orpheus, and with Platonic Philosophy. "The question between them and me," Bacon remarked, "being only as to the way."

With further reference to the 52 rules instituted for the use of the Fraternity, there were to be 63 members of various grades of initiation, apprentices, brethren, and an "imperator," who were all sworn to secrecy for 100 years, Whilst passing in public under their own names, they adopted feigned initials or mottoes in order to be identified by their initiated friends. The Brethren, upon interrogation, were to profess ignorance on all subjects relating to the Society—except the art of Healing. They were to cure the sick in body and mind without payment or reward. In his "Promus" we find Bacon registering his resolve to do good to others, without regard of private advantage or profit; and if Plato had contemned the healing art, Bacon vindicated its dignity by appealing to the example of Christ, and reminded man that the great Physician of the soul did not disdain also to be the physician of the body. If "a man set before him honest and good ends . . and be resolute, constant, and true unto them: it will follow that he shall mould himself into all virtue at once."

It needs no strong imagination to realize what power such a Society would possess under the driving force of so original a mind

as that of Francis Bacon, endowed in almost equally balanced proportions with every intellectual faculty.

It would not appear that the Society in the form we know it existed before 1575, or that it issued any publication before 1580: Bacon was in France for the last three years of that period. What was he doing besides studying the art and inventing a system of cipher, or writing the Essays fathered by Michel de Montaigne? The chronicle is silent.

What individuals or Society—if not the Rosicrucians—were responsible for the expensive and elaborate effort of publishing the First Folio; a volume of 1,000 pages? How came it about that a number of books were published during 17th century as written by various authors; but which it is now generally believed were original works of Bacon left in MS. on his death? It must be added could any man, however colossal his powers, however long his literary life, have written all the works which evidence shows to be Bacon's, or his at least in conception, substance, and diction, even though often it would seem paraphrased, interpolated, or altered by other hands. Yet with the help of the Rosicrucian Fraternity in its obscurity and mystery this could be accomplished.

The whole circle of publications covering a certain period bear a strange connection and affinity, possessing as they do the same typographical errors, variations in type, woodcuts, water-marks, paper-marks, and secret signs.

That these works were produced with the highest motive is to be inferred from the frequency with which after the word "Finis," such sentences are to be found as, "To God only wise be praise through Jesus Christ for ever": "Laus Deo": "Soli Deo Gratia": "Non nobis Domini non nobis sed nomini tuo da gloriam." Even in purely secular works the letters "L.S.D." (Laus Soli Deo) are given.

What was the cause of Bacon's great poverty, when he was living very quietly and at small personal expense? Was he straitening his means by publishing in order to carry out part of the "Universal Reformation?" Was Anthony Bacon's long sojourn abroad entirely aimless; and were his continuous letters to his brother for the sake of retailing mere gossip? Is it not significant that all these letters are missing? Was Anthony not acting as propagandist on the continent for Francis's secret society and new philosophy and collecting and forwarding to him important intelligence and books? Twin in heart and soul Anthony energetically collaborated with his brother, devoting to the service of the cause not only his means, but life itself, until his untimely death in 1601.

There is a mystery besides about the correspondence between Bacon and Sir Tobie Matthew—his most intimate friend, and "kind inquisitor," and to whom Francis dedicated his Essay on

"Friendship." Sir Tobie wandered abroad and was sometimes mysteriously occupied. The letters referred to are as a rule not only without date but likewise appear to have been stripped of all particulars that might serve to fit the occasion for which they were penned. Having become a priest in the Jesuit College at Douai, Matthew may well have aided Bacon in the translation and dissemination of his works, and in the production of the Douai Bible.

Bacon thought that every properly instructed tongue could be made to bear witness, and that it was part of his task to draw together a great cloud of witnesses to the philosophy he was propounding. There was, for instance, a certain Mr. Doyly, whom Bacon addressed as "My verye deare friend," who was Anthony's companion abroad: after residing in Paris, Doyly appears in Flanders: what his business was is unknown. And there was also Nicholas Faunt, Walsingham's one time secretary, a Puritan, and also Anthony's intimate associate! He is described as an "able intelligencer," who from 1580-2 was travelling with no ostensible object through France and Germany, visiting also Geneva and Northern Italy.

These and many other of Bacon's devoted friends must have had some definite aim in their travels. Were they not maintaining, strengthening and extending contacts between the Society abroad, and the English counterpart at home? There is little doubt that Ben Jonson, known to have been one of Bacon's "able vens," was under his master one of the leading workers in the Rosicrucian cause. He twice refers to the Fraternity in his play "The Staple of News."

Mr. Vaughan says that I should have shown that "Bacon had anything at all to do with Masonry." I thought the fact that he was the father of modern Masonry was so well established, among Baconians at least, that proofs were uncalled for. I hope, however, that he does not include Mr. Alfred Dodd among those "writers whose work is the subject of ridicule." If so, nothing I can say will shake Mr. Vaughan's invincible prejudice. "For," remarked Bacon, "as Solomon saith, he that cometh to seek after knowledge with a mind to scorn and censure, shall be sure to find matter for his humour, but no matter for his instruction."

As the Templars were the successors of the Knights of the Round Table, so the Rosicrucians appear to have assumed the mantle of the Templars. "The names change," wrote W. F. C. Wigston; "the rites alter, the philosophy may be different, but the principles remain affiliating all these societies to Masonry, which is the oral method of transmission of which Bacon hints in his works."

It is an interesting coincidence that at Gorhambury, Bacon would live in a house constructed out of the stones of the Abbey, which the Hond Masons of King Offa erected to the memory of St. Alban

the martyr. "And St. Alban . . . loved well masons, and cherished them much, and made their pay right good . . ." (Lansdowne MS. 1560). The abbey of St. Alban's it is claimed was the cradle if not the birthplace of Masonry in England. Therein was the tomb of the "good Duke Humphrey," of Gloucester, and there was there a Latin inscription to his memory, containing an allusion to the legend of the miraculous restoration to sight of a blind man at St. Alban's shrine, and said to have been exposed by the Duke. To this incident 'Shakespeare' alludes in 2nd Part Henry VI.

Mr. Vaughan thinks that any suggestion that Francis Bacon wrote the "Chemical Marriage" is an insult to his memory. I can see nothing incompatible with the belief that such a romance could and might well have been written by Bacon, in his youth. The book is not a 'ludibrium,' but betrays a serious purpose and conceals a recondite meaning; and if the author and founder of the Brotherhood was a boy of 15, is it likely that in the same era two different youths of like ages should each harbour the same world-embracing plans for the benefit of humanity; and that one should establish a great secret society, which spread all over Europe, and the other build up a great philosophy, destined to live and bear fruit so long as civilization endures?

Many of Bacon's works, notably "Sylva Sylvarum," the "New Atlantis," and "The History of Life and Death" seem to be parables or figurative pieces conveying a double meaning to those capable of discerning.

The further evidence on the question supplied by your correspondent, Mr. L. Biddulph, is both interesting and valuable.

Yours faithfully,

R. J. A. Bunnett.

NOTES AND NOTICES.

The *Times Literary Supplement* reports the offer of a First Folio Shakespeare by an Exeter bookseller, for which its owner is asking £1,500. The leaf of verses before the title-page, the title-page itself, the first leaf of the dedication and the last two leaves are in facsimile. The name of the previous owner and that of the house from which the treasure came have not been made public, but it was purchased in a bundle of old folios at the sale of a small country-house library in South Devon. The previous owner had never recognised it.

Yet another portrait said to be of Shakespeare has recently come into the market. "There are at least two hundred portraits for which," writes Mr. A. C. R. Carter, in the *Daily Telegraph and Morning Post*, "the claim has been made that they truly represent the features of Shakespeare." The verdict of the market for the one in question was 12 guineas; yet we are told it was confidently believed to portray Shakespeare in black dress and white collar at the age of 29. It was an oval panel, too.

The Prime Minister quoted *Measure for Measure*, Act II, Sc. 2, in the House of Commons during a review of the international situation last Session. "Although it is good to have a giant's strength," he said, "it is tyrannous to use it like a giant." The Premier was accused, in a letter in *The Times* next day, by Dr. Temperley, Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge, "of a conscious (or unconscious) echo" of one of Canning's speeches delivered in 1826. To the Professor's "remarkable parallel" the Premier replied that he had never read either of the passages quoted and his words were entirely his own!

The Prime Minister's quotation of Hotspur's lines in *Henry IV* Part I, Act 2, Scene 3,—"Out of this nettle danger, we pluck this flower, safety"—has passed into history. In the same play (Act 5, Sc. 1) there is a tribute to that same Hotspur offered by the Prince

of Wales, afterwards Henry V, which we can surely echo in all gratitude to Mr. Chamberlain—

"A braver gentleman
More active-valiant, or more valiant young
More daring or more bold, is now alive
To grace this latter age with noble deeds"

Mr. Chamberlain's love of Shakespeare is well known as was the late Lord Grey of Falloden's. In Arthur Mee's "One Thousand Famous Things," Lord Grey is quoted as saying—

"When I was out of office after eleven years, very tired and for the time not fit for anything, I spent some weeks alone in the country.

"During this time I read several of Shakespeare's plays.

"The impression produced upon me by his incredible power and range was really that of awe; I felt almost afraid to be alone in the room with him, as if I were in the presence of something supernatural."

"There is Shakespeare in front of the building and I have put bacon inside. What more would you like?" asked the grocer who converted the Theatre Royal, Worthing, into a warehouse eighty years ago. To this grocer the building owes its preservation, and Sir J. Martin Harvey recently unveiled a tablet commemorating the glorious days of Macready, Phelps and Edmund Kean.

We are indebted to the *Daily Telegraph and Morning Post* for the following interesting theory about the origin of Shakespeare's surname, developed in C. L'Estrange Ewen's recently published "Guide to the Origin of British Surnames":—

The explanation depends on Mr. Ewen's "doctrine of synonymous change." He suggests in this that in the 13th century, when secondary descriptive surnames were becoming commoner, a man might be equally correctly described by several synonyms in one or more languages.

Mr. Ewen gives some convincing illustrations.

A 13th-century Israelite known as Cohen—priest—might alternatively be described as Episcopus, l'Eveske, or Bishop. Occasionally, such synonyms were only suppositional, consisting of a mistranslation of a misunderstood word.

An elaborate process of the sort, Mr. Ewen believes, occurred in the case of the name Shakespere, later Shakespeare, which is described as having the greatest fame of all misunderstood surnames.

Although very widespread throughout England, research does not reveal it to be of greater age than the 14th century, except for

one example in Surrey in 1268 and a possible one in Gloucestershire in 1248.

By collating all known synonyms in the same or different families from 1200 to 1543, Mr. Ewen is able to list as true or suppositional equivalents the name of the only English Pope, Adrian IV, Brekespeare, Bruselaunce, Brekestaf, Waggebastun, Waggestaf, Waggespere, Bricelaunce, Shakelaunce, Brekedaunce, Shakehaft, Shakstafe, Shakeshafte, Skakelock, Schakelock, Skatheloc, Shakelok, Longstaf, Longestak and Shakespere, as well as de Saxby and Shakespey.

The equivalence depends in most cases on the fact that "to spar or sperre" formerly signified "to lock or bolt," and that "to shak," when speaking of wood, signified to "split" or "crack."

From the older names in Coventry, Scathelok and Shakelok, Mr. Ewen works back to an Old English personal name, Sceaft-loc, both elements of which were of the type used for names in the Anglo-Saxon period. He emphasises and clarifies his conclusion by a pedigree of the name of Shakespere in Warwickshire and Gloucestershire, which, although he admits is partly conjectural, is plausible and impressive.

Starting from Sceaft-loc, he works through Skatheloc and Shakeloc to Shakespere, and from there to Shakehaft, Shakstaff and Shakeshaft.

The rest of Mr. Ewen's study examines the problems of surnames in a scholarly and documented way, providing a basis for study for the beginner and pointing out the pitfalls of interpreting a surname at its face value.